



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.								
10/721,471	11/26/2003	Daniel K. Tor	ASH03009	8133								
25537 VERIZON PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP 1320 North Court House Road 9th Floor ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909	7590 04/14/2010		<table border="1"><tr><td colspan="2">EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">CARDENAS NAVIA, JAIME F</td></tr><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">3624</td></tr></table>		EXAMINER		CARDENAS NAVIA, JAIME F		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	3624	
EXAMINER												
CARDENAS NAVIA, JAIME F												
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER											
3624												
			<table border="1"><tr><td>NOTIFICATION DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>04/14/2010</td><td>ELECTRONIC</td></tr></table>		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	04/14/2010	ELECTRONIC				
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE											
04/14/2010	ELECTRONIC											

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@verizon.com

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered. In particular, Applicant claims to have refuted Examiner's newly cited Official Notice. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner continues to assert that "for one party to register another party" is a fact capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known, and disagrees that this fact is expressly stated in Applicant's specification.

Par. 20 of Applicant's specification does indeed teach an inmate entering into the system basic data for one or more potential visitors. In par. 21, the system contacts the one or more potential visitors, notifying them of the visitation request. The one or more potential visitors are then requested to register for a visit.

Examiner believes there is an important distinction between what is claimed in claim 1 and what is taught in paragraphs 20 and 21. Claim 1 states "means for sending from one of the plurality of potential visitors a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors based upon the received visitation request." Par. 21 teaches means for sending from an inmate a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors. Thus, neither par. 20 or 21 expressly teach the officially noticed fact.

Moving on, par. 65 of Applicant's specification teaches that a visitor can schedule one or more visits by entering in the registration number for each visitor that will be part of the visit. Once again, this paragraph does not teach the claimed step of "means for sending from one of the plurality of potential visitors a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors based upon the received visitation request." Instead, it teaches means for sending from one of the plurality of potential visitors a scheduling request for each of the plurality of potential visitors based upon the received visitation request. What is missing from the specification, but

implied, is means for one of the plurality of potential visitors to send a registration request for each of the plurality of potential visitors (meaning registering other potential visitors) based upon the received visitation request. This implied step would precede the step of sending a scheduling request, as registration numbers are required for scheduling. This is why Examiner took Official Notice of this implied step, which is that it is old and well-known for one party to register another party. This could be as simple as a track coach registering their athletes for a competition, or a supervisor registering their employees for a training session.

As an extra point, Examiner finds no indication in the specification that one of the plurality of potential visitors has access to the personal information of the other potential visitors through the system (supplied by the inmate), as asserted by Applicant on p. 12, lines 18-20 of the Remarks section.

For at least these reasons, Examiner continues to uphold the newly cited Official Notice, as it has not in fact been refuted, and therefore the rejection.

/J. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 3624
April 7, 2010

/Romain Jeanty/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3624